

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



5722N

*E. A. de Schweinitz*

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.  
DIVISION OF STATISTICS.

---

REPORT

UPON THE

NUMBERS AND VALUES OF FARM ANIMALS,

AND ON

COTTON DISTRIBUTION.

---

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

---

January-February, 1893.

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.  
1893.



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.  
DIVISION OF STATISTICS.

---

REPORT

UPON THE

NUMBERS AND VALUES OF FARM ANIMALS,

AND ON

COTTON DISTRIBUTION.

---

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

---

January-February, 1893.

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.  
1893.



## JANUARY-FEBRUARY REPORT.

---

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
DIVISION OF STATISTICS,  
*Washington, D. C., February 10, 1893.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith, for publication, results of our annual returns of increase or decrease of farm animals, and their value in each State and Territory. The tables of numbers and values are presented in full, and present results of what is practically a cattle census, in which the work is done and made public within five weeks.

The usual February cotton returns are also presented.

Respectfully,

J. R. DODGE,  
*Statistician.*

Hon. J. M. RUSK,  
*Secretary.*

---

### REPORT ON FARM ANIMALS.

#### NUMBERS.

The interest in horse-breeding continues, and numbers are increasing. The competition of the West is not so much felt in the Atlantic States in horse-raising as in cattle-growing. It is claimed by our State agent in New York, that the soil, grass, and water of New York produce horses of stronger bone, sounder feet, and harder muscle than the alkaline soil on which so many western horses are reared; and that attention is given to the breeding of a finer class of horses for road and carriage purposes. This claim, however, is not admitted by those interested in horse-breeding in the West. Improvement in numbers and quality of horses is reported in Virginia. The introduction of Hambletonian and other strains of thoroughbred blood has been of great advantage in North Carolina. In the cotton States, especially the Gulf States east of Texas, the rule has been to purchase from Tennessee or Kentucky, in preference to raising horses, but there are signs of some change in this respect.

It is gratifying to note the reported tendency in Texas to improvement through better breeds. Kentucky shows no tendency to reduction of numbers, though prices are not satisfactory. Throughout the Ohio Valley there is little change in numbers of horses. Horse-raising in Iowa is less absorbing as a rural enterprise than it has been, except as to trotting stock. There is ready sale for well-bred horses in Missouri, at a good price, and increasing tendency to improvement in quality. In Kansas the supply is greater than the demand, except for desirable draft horses. A strong tendency to increase the stock of horses is apparent on the Pacific coast, and especially in California.

There appears but little change in numbers of milch cows, a slight decline being reported in some States, and a small increase in others, especially in the districts of enlarging population in the distant West. There is less fluctuation in this class of farm animals than in any other, as the milk supply must be kept up, and ample provision made for the relatively uniform requirements of butter and cheese factories. A steady increase has been apparent in the past, which will continue as population advances.

There is a decrease in the number of store cattle. The scarcity of feed in Virginia induced farmers to sell off feeding bullocks closely. The no-fence law in some of the Southern States has caused a reduction of numbers, the more worthless of the old stock having been sacrificed to the manifest improvement of the existing herds. The low price of cattle in the ranch regions, and the discouragement after long waiting for a rise, has tended to reduce the numbers of cattle. In some States there has been a reduction made, after investigation covering the changes of recent years, from the estimates of last year. It was hoped that the results of the national census of 1890 would be available in the comparison and revision of data collected, but up to the date of issue of this report it is not at hand, nothing having been received excepting a statement of farm animals on ranges, which is not an enumeration, but the result of local estimates, and therefore differing little from our own substitute for a true census.

The increase in numbers of sheep continues, as a result of a progressive advance in prices for four years past, being, as estimated, 2,335,188 in the past year. There has been an increase in Virginia and South Carolina, and in the Western States, as a rule. There is a tendency to enlargement of the proportion of mutton sheep, east of the Missouri River.

The increase of numbers of swine in 1891 was followed by a heavy misfortune in the reduction of the proportion of young pigs raised. The excessively wet weather of spring caused the loss of an unusual proportion of the natural increase. It was early seen that numbers would be considerably reduced. In September our report showed a decrease in the number of fattening swine, though the earlier spring pigs were forced into fattening to supply the deficiency, and many of

the breeders were sacrificed to meet the growing demands of the packing trade. These animals are so prolific, and their average term of life so short, that extreme fluctuations are liable to occur; but while the decline has been sudden and heavy, the recuperation may be equally rapid under the influence of increased values.

The numbers at present are thus compared with those of last year:

Stock.	1892.	1893.	Increase or decrease.
Horses . . . . .	15,498,140	16,206,802	+ 708,662
Mules . . . . .	2,314,699	2,331,128	+ 16,429
Milch cows . . . . .	16,416,351	16,424,087	+ 7,736
Oxen and other cattle . . . . .	37,651,239	35,954,196	-1,697,043
Sheep . . . . .	44,938,365	47,273,553	+2,335,188
Swine . . . . .	52,398,019	46,094,807	-6,303,212

The heavy reduction in the numbers of swine makes the grand aggregate of farm animals less than last year. Except as to swine there is increase in the aggregate of more than a million animals. In many cases the growers of cattle have transferred their interest to horses. A tendency to improvement in quality is active, increasing intrinsic value and possibilities of future success.

#### VALUES.

The increase in the supply of horses has been attended by a reduction in their average price of \$3.75 per head, while the decline in the value of mules has been \$4.87. All other farm animals have advanced in value, store cattle least and hogs most. In the case of cattle it seems to be the beginning of an advance, which promises still higher values for growers, in sympathy with the rise in prices of beefeves ready for slaughter. The average farm value of sheep has advanced 39 per cent since 1889. The increase in the value of swine has been 39 per cent in a single year, the result of a change from apparent plethora to absolute scarcity.

The average value per head for all ages of all classes of animals, as compared with values of 1892, with the increase or decrease, is thus presented.

Stock.	1892.	1893.	Increase or decrease.
Horses . . . . .	\$65.01	\$61.22	-\$3.79
Mules . . . . .	75.55	70.68	- 4.87
Milch cows . . . . .	21.40	21.73	+ .33
Oxen and other cattle . . . . .	15.16	15.24	+ .08
Sheep . . . . .	2.58	2.66	+ .08
Swine . . . . .	4.60	6.41	+ 1.81

The aggregate value of farm animals is greater than a year ago, notwithstanding the reduced numbers, being \$2,483,083,249 instead of \$2,461,755,678, an increase of \$21,327,571. Notwithstanding a reduction in number of swine of 12 per cent, the aggregate value is increased \$9,787,994. This is in accordance with the usual rule by which values increase as scarcity is intensified in disproportionate ratio. Often a small crop brings more money than a large one. The following statement gives a comparison of aggregate values of two enumerations:

Stock.	1892.	1893.	Increase or decrease.
Horses.....	\$1,007,593,636	\$992,225,185	-\$15,368,451
Mules.....	174,882,070	164,763,751	- 10,118,319
Milch cows.....	351,378,132	356,876,353	+ 5,498,221
Oxen and other cattle.....	570,749,155	547,882,204	- 22,866,951
Sheep.....	116,121,270	125,909,264	+ 9,787,994
Swine.....	241,031,415	295,426,492	+ 54,395,077
Total .....	2,461,755,678	2,483,083,249	+ 21,327,571

The advance in beeves for slaughter occurred in 1891, which has been sustained during the past year, as seen by the following figures for Chicago market prices in the first week in January, given in connection with those of sheep and swine:

*Price per 100 pounds.*

Species and grades.	1892.	1893.
<b>Cattle:</b>		
Choice shipping.....	\$5.30 to \$6.00	\$5.30 to \$6.00
Fair to good.....	3.75 <b>40</b>	3.90 4.60
<b>Sheep:</b>		
Native.....	3.75 <b>5.40</b>	3.20 5.40
Westerns.....	3.75 5.10	3.00 5.25
<b>Hogs:</b>		
Rough packing.....	3.75 3.90	7.00 7.20
Heavy packing.....	3.95 4.15	7.25 7.55

The increase in swine is very heavy, and is more fully indicated in the following detailed statement, by classes:

Swine.	Jan. 6, 1893.	Jan. 5, 1892.	Feb. 9, 1893.
Pigs.....	\$5.90 to \$7.10	\$3.10 to \$3.75	\$5.90 to \$7.75
Light.....	6.95 7.35	3.70 4.00	7.65 8.25
Rough packing.....	7.00 7.20	3.70 3.85	8.05 8.25
Mixed.....	7.05 7.45	3.80 4.00	7.95 8.50
Heavy.....	7.25 7.55	3.90 4.10	8.30 8.70

Estimated prices of animals on farms and ranches in January, 1893.

States and Territories.	Horses.				Mules.				Milch cows.
	Under 1 year old.	Between 1 and 2 years old.	Between 2 and 3 years old.	Over 3 years old.	Under 1 year old.	Between 1 and 2 years old.	Between 2 and 3 years old.	Over 3 years old.	
Maine . . . . .	\$30.00	\$47.50	\$69.00	\$95.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	\$24.50
New Hampshire . . . . .	29.00	45.00	65.60	92.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	25.70
Vermont . . . . .	26.50	42.00	61.00	87.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	23.63
Massachusetts . . . . .	38.00	58.75	86.25	110.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	33.00
Rhode Island . . . . .	38.00	60.75	88.00	108.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	30.00
Connecticut . . . . .	39.50	63.50	90.00	110.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	28.00
New York . . . . .	32.50	55.00	77.50	99.00	\$35.00	\$50.00	\$75.00	\$101.00	26.36
New Jersey . . . . .	42.50	66.00	88.00	108.00	43.00	63.00	91.00	115.00	35.50
Pennsylvania . . . . .	33.00	55.00	74.07	97.39	35.83	56.00	82.00	106.08	25.75
Delaware . . . . .	31.00	44.17	65.00	95.00	33.00	50.00	79.00	107.00	24.17
Maryland . . . . .	30.78	48.31	72.00	95.00	35.50	59.00	87.92	115.00	26.15
Virginia . . . . .	28.41	45.00	66.00	85.50	33.23	52.01	79.04	97.00	20.00
North Carolina . . . . .	31.43	49.11	71.90	90.86	36.42	56.21	82.00	102.32	16.50
South Carolina . . . . .	32.20	52.00	72.64	95.00	36.00	55.44	84.38	105.00	20.00
Georgia . . . . .	30.61	48.11	73.11	95.93	33.75	52.46	84.00	105.00	18.10
Florida . . . . .	25.00	36.00	55.00	82.00	27.00	46.00	71.00	104.00	16.00
Alabama . . . . .	27.00	41.00	58.00	78.00	32.05	48.00	72.00	92.00	14.25
Mississippi . . . . .	22.00	32.50	47.00	70.00	26.04	42.00	60.00	85.00	13.50
Louisiana . . . . .	17.00	24.00	40.00	65.00	24.00	40.00	57.00	90.00	18.00
Texas . . . . .	13.00	19.03	27.22	37.48	21.60	33.00	44.14	62.00	14.50
Arkansas . . . . .	21.00	30.00	44.41	65.00	28.47	40.92	59.87	77.77	11.50
Tennessee . . . . .	32.00	48.00	64.00	80.00	35.42	52.00	70.00	86.27	16.15
West Virginia . . . . .	26.00	39.00	59.00	79.00	29.64	48.00	66.00	88.00	20.25
Kentucky . . . . .	33.02	50.00	68.00	87.50	36.00	52.00	73.00	91.00	21.50
Ohio . . . . .	30.00	47.00	69.00	88.00	33.00	49.00	70.00	90.00	25.95
Michigan . . . . .	31.58	49.44	72.41	96.82	32.00	50.00	71.00	95.00	27.50
Indiana . . . . .	32.00	47.00	70.00	90.00	35.00	50.00	71.00	88.00	24.50
Illinois . . . . .	28.68	45.00	65.00	85.00	32.72	46.77	66.75	86.00	23.00
Wisconsin . . . . .	29.06	45.86	65.20	93.88	29.31	42.50	65.10	92.00	22.91
Minnesota . . . . .	29.43	45.24	66.66	95.00	31.00	47.94	72.53	95.00	19.50
Iowa . . . . .	26.00	39.00	55.00	80.00	27.52	40.73	59.00	81.74	21.00
Missouri . . . . .	24.52	35.67	49.00	67.00	31.19	44.34	61.00	78.58	17.00
Kansas . . . . .	23.77	34.88	49.38	68.00	28.47	41.77	57.54	79.16	18.50
Nebraska . . . . .	22.00	33.50	50.00	72.50	27.38	40.39	61.18	82.48	18.50
South Dakota . . . . .	27.00	40.00	58.00	83.00	30.44	44.17	61.00	85.00	17.75
North Dakota . . . . .	29.00	44.42	62.00	90.00	33.75	47.00	69.00	98.00	20.50
Montana . . . . .	16.00	22.00	31.00	43.42	18.33	26.67	45.00	63.75	28.50
Wyoming . . . . .	14.00	20.00	30.00	41.00	22.00	35.00	50.00	72.00	30.00
Colorado . . . . .	16.60	25.07	37.00	55.00	23.00	35.00	52.00	76.00	25.50
New Mexico . . . . .	9.00	15.00	21.00	30.00	13.00	23.50	34.00	47.50	20.00
Arizona . . . . .	12.50	20.50	31.00	42.50	10.00	18.00	26.00	35.00	20.10
Utah . . . . .	14.00	22.00	34.00	48.00	17.00	27.00	40.00	65.00	24.00
Nevada . . . . .	15.00	23.00	34.00	55.00	15.00	31.67	45.00	75.00	30.00
Idaho . . . . .	14.00	22.00	32.33	41.17	20.50	28.00	40.00	53.00	25.00
Washington . . . . .	26.50	38.57	60.00	77.06	24.00	36.00	56.00	75.00	33.00
Oregon . . . . .	20.00	30.00	42.00	65.00	21.46	32.00	50.00	73.00	24.00
California . . . . .	21.00	32.00	48.00	75.00	26.00	40.00	60.00	87.00	27.25
General average . . . . .	25.98	39.58	56.80	78.62	31.20	46.00	65.64	87.40	21.75

*Estimated prices of animals on farms and ranches in January, 1893—Continued.*

States and Territories.	Oxen and other cattle.				Sheep.		Hogs.	
	Under 1 year old.	Between 1 and 2 years old.	Between 2 and 3 years old.	Over 3 years old.	Under 1 year old.	Over 1 year old.	Under 1 year old.	Over 1 year old.
Maine.....	\$8.25	\$13.00	\$18.75	\$32.00	\$2.40	\$2.89	\$8.50	\$16.75
New Hampshire.....	7.50	12.00	18.20	30.50	2.50	3.10	8.31	16.00
Vermont.....	7.00	11.50	17.50	30.00	3.07	3.86	8.00	16.25
Massachusetts.....	9.50	15.00	23.00	35.00	3.60	4.50	8.75	17.00
Rhode Island.....	9.00	14.50	22.50	33.50	3.58	4.42	8.50	15.75
Connecticut.....	10.79	16.57	25.29	36.86	3.35	4.25	8.50	16.75
New York.....	9.00	15.29	24.37	34.42	3.25	4.00	7.00	13.50
New Jersey.....	12.00	18.00	28.18	37.09	3.60	4.40	9.21	15.82
Pennsylvania.....	8.84	14.85	22.20	31.65	3.15	3.95	7.03	13.45
Delaware.....	7.75	13.00	20.00	27.50	3.25	3.75	6.00	11.00
Maryland.....	8.50	14.00	20.88	30.50	3.50	4.15	5.25	10.77
Virginia.....	6.50	10.81	16.61	22.88	2.50	3.20	3.07	6.50
North Carolina.....	4.50	7.38	11.61	15.36	1.20	1.80	2.75	6.25
South Carolina.....	5.75	8.00	12.00	17.00	1.55	2.05	3.14	7.00
Georgia.....	4.29	6.59	9.65	13.24	1.30	1.95	2.59	5.17
Florida.....	4.21	5.90	8.85	12.50	1.35	2.10	1.75	3.85
Alabama.....	4.00	5.83	8.55	12.19	1.10	1.70	2.28	4.93
Mississippi.....	3.14	4.63	7.23	10.80	1.10	1.65	2.20	4.70
Louisiana.....	4.69	6.92	9.55	14.21	1.09	1.75	2.18	5.19
Texas.....	4.50	6.51	9.36	12.71	1.08	1.83	2.70	5.60
Arkansas.....	3.50	4.90	7.75	12.00	1.15	1.68	2.00	4.50
Tennessee.....	4.25	7.06	11.21	15.88	1.81	2.50	3.63	7.43
West Virginia.....	7.75	13.75	22.50	31.90	2.40	3.30	4.22	8.53
Kentucky.....	7.00	12.08	19.23	27.43	2.70	3.60	4.15	9.00
Ohio.....	8.97	15.68	24.61	33.41	2.50	3.45	6.00	11.92
Michigan.....	7.77	14.17	22.12	31.32	2.70	3.70	6.00	11.50
Indiana.....	8.50	14.02	22.01	30.00	3.10	4.20	6.00	12.00
Illinois.....	8.00	14.00	22.19	30.00	2.95	4.00	6.25	13.00
Wisconsin.....	7.00	11.88	18.26	26.00	2.40	3.30	6.30	13.00
Minnesota.....	6.50	10.49	16.00	25.48	2.25	3.20	5.80	11.87
Iowa.....	7.81	13.72	21.58	29.00	2.75	4.00	7.00	13.40
Missouri.....	6.52	11.03	18.00	24.35	2.21	3.09	4.50	9.05
Kansas.....	6.76	11.82	18.00	24.37	1.85	2.82	6.39	12.00
Nebraska.....	6.82	11.86	17.92	23.71	1.95	3.00	6.35	11.90
South Dakota.....	6.45	10.88	17.25	24.25	2.50	3.60	6.20	12.85
North Dakota.....	7.50	12.00	20.52	27.50	2.38	3.25	5.70	11.46
Montana.....	8.82	13.73	19.27	26.00	2.10	2.82	7.60	13.75
Wyoming.....	8.50	12.00	17.00	24.00	2.15	3.00	7.50	12.00
Colorado.....	6.98	11.00	16.00	24.00	1.80	2.75	6.00	11.00
New Mexico.....	4.75	8.00	11.00	15.00	1.00	1.75	4.25	9.75
Arizona.....	5.00	8.00	13.00	16.00	1.50	2.25	4.50	8.25
Utah.....	5.81	10.25	16.00	21.00	1.87	2.64	7.00	13.00
Nevada.....	7.67	13.00	17.50	22.00	1.83	2.67	4.60	10.25
Idaho.....	6.33	11.00	16.00	21.00	2.01	2.50	5.00	10.00
Washington.....	11.17	17.11	23.00	31.00	2.10	3.20	5.75	11.00
Oregon.....	6.79	10.59	15.53	22.55	1.70	2.75	3.15	6.60
California.....	7.48	11.84	19.00	25.00	1.69	2.55	4.50	9.00
General average.....	6.46	10.81	16.67	22.17	2.07	2.93	5.04	9.51

*Estimated number of animals on farms and ranches, total value of each kind, and average price, January, 1893.*

States and Territories.	Horses.			Mules.		
	Number.	Average price.	Value.	Number.	Average price.	Value.
Maine . . . . .	111,051	\$79.84	\$8,865,781	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire . . . . .	54,039	77.73	4,200,328	.....	.....	.....
Vermont . . . . .	92,966	68.33	6,352,390	.....	.....	.....
Massachusetts . . . . .	65,109	102.18	6,652,559	.....	.....	.....
Rhode Island . . . . .	10,340	100.74	1,041,622	.....	.....	.....
Connecticut . . . . .	45,313	100.25	4,542,619	.....	.....	.....
New York . . . . .	669,353	84.26	56,403,020	4,819	\$91.13	\$439,174
New Jersey . . . . .	87,706	95.71	8,393,915	8,380	110.32	924,464
Pennsylvania . . . . .	628,080	78.48	49,289,469	29,210	93.75	2,738,294
Delaware . . . . .	25,553	80.22	2,049,814	4,826	101.85	491,549
Maryland . . . . .	133,685	75.56	10,101,585	13,622	103.06	1,403,879
Virginia . . . . .	248,658	68.91	17,135,626	37,545	82.81	3,109,067
North Carolina . . . . .	133,185	77.67	10,344,475	99,784	86.49	8,630,310
South Carolina . . . . .	60,811	86.64	5,268,668	87,267	95.61	8,343,293
Georgia . . . . .	104,935	81.60	8,562,298	158,043	93.08	14,710,547
Florida . . . . .	32,816	68.30	2,241,349	10,456	91.80	959,850
Alabama . . . . .	123,511	66.03	8,155,435	135,415	80.64	10,920,434
Mississippi . . . . .	159,466	59.54	9,495,396	163,978	75.36	12,357,840
Louisiana . . . . .	132,125	52.01	6,871,827	90,985	79.90	7,269,699
Texas . . . . .	1,246,205	29.01	36,151,400	241,751	48.96	11,835,587
Arkansas . . . . .	190,820	51.97	9,916,082	137,139	64.69	8,871,887
Tennessee . . . . .	321,546	63.52	20,424,624	220,190	63.96	14,084,257
West Virginia . . . . .	158,555	58.06	9,205,705	7,239	67.87	491,275
Kentucky . . . . .	410,420	68.13	27,963,224	153,291	64.50	9,887,255
Ohio . . . . .	891,093	68.74	61,253,716	18,000	75.24	1,354,320
Michigan . . . . .	530,294	76.67	40,659,672	3,783	87.92	332,613
Indiana . . . . .	747,014	70.24	52,470,278	56,557	70.38	3,980,497
Illinois . . . . .	1,377,654	65.03	89,582,790	105,778	68.07	7,200,699
Wisconsin . . . . .	480,479	73.30	35,219,199	5,289	79.66	421,324
Minnesota . . . . .	475,021	76.32	36,255,007	9,757	84.98	829,130
Iowa . . . . .	1,353,791	61.34	83,041,533	40,208	66.90	2,689,972
Missouri . . . . .	988,589	50.72	50,140,250	249,348	57.45	14,324,516
Kansas . . . . .	1,000,594	55.59	55,626,845	92,399	66.95	6,186,220
Nebraska . . . . .	687,822	57.83	39,776,734	46,474	70.63	3,282,531
South Dakota . . . . .	293,800	63.41	18,629,858	8,200	76.77	629,546
North Dakota . . . . .	161,880	68.75	11,128,775	7,840	88.03	690,137
Montana . . . . .	206,862	34.98	7,236,244	1,243	47.10	58,545
Wyoming . . . . .	97,087	30.49	2,960,175	1,368	65.02	88,942
Colorado . . . . .	185,458	44.05	8,169,880	5,236	71.29	373,250
New Mexico . . . . .	91,140	23.31	2,124,474	3,638	40.68	147,976
Arizona . . . . .	52,175	30.00	1,565,250	1,340	50.00	67,000
Utah . . . . .	76,791	31.24	2,398,948	1,825	48.08	87,748
Nevada . . . . .	60,645	40.00	2,425,782	1,688	52.93	89,354
Idaho . . . . .	192,917	36.00	6,945,012	1,053	40.00	42,120
Washington . . . . .	196,115	59.58	11,683,903	1,378	67.50	93,017
Oregon . . . . .	294,509	45.77	13,479,667	4,755	52.47	249,503
California . . . . .	518,824	57.48	29,821,982	60,031	67.90	4,076,130
Total . . . . .	16,206,802	61.22	992,225,185	2,331,128	70.68	164,763,751

*Estimated number of animals on farms and ranches, etc.—Continued.*

States and Territories.	Milch cows.			Oxen and other cattle.		
	Number.	Average price.	Value.	Number.	Average price.	Value.
Maine.....	174, 120	\$24. 50	\$4, 265, 940	145, 031	\$22. 07	\$3, 201, 192
New Hampshire.....	109, 306	25. 70	2, 809, 164	109, 292	21. 57	2, 357, 205
Vermont.....	238, 856	23. 63	5, 644, 167	160, 717	20. 82	3, 346, 122
Massachusetts.....	181, 770	33. 00	5, 998, 410	92, 927	24. 66	2, 292, 036
Rhode Island.....	24, 279	30. 00	728, 370	11, 831	26. 85	317, 651
Connecticut.....	134, 884	28. 00	3, 776, 752	96, 107	28. 66	2, 754, 830
New York.....	1, 556, 874	26. 36	41, 039, 199	768, 040	26. 57	20, 410, 650
New Jersey.....	188, 846	35. 50	6, 704, 033	61, 930	28. 64	1, 773, 961
Pennsylvania.....	938, 382	25. 75	24, 163, 337	793, 461	22. 05	17, 491, 915
Delaware.....	31, 330	24. 17	757, 246	27, 941	22. 38	625, 396
Maryland.....	149, 016	26. 15	3, 896, 768	119, 834	21. 39	2, 562, 652
Virginia.....	279, 411	20. 00	5, 588, 220	406, 937	16. 10	6, 551, 606
North Carolina.....	272, 073	16. 50	4, 489, 205	382, 637	11. 14	4, 262, 191
South Carolina.....	157, 024	20. 00	3, 140, 480	202, 085	12. 28	2, 481, 604
Georgia.....	347, 491	18. 10	6, 289, 587	552, 124	9. 44	5, 210, 890
Florida.....	57, 166	16. 00	914, 656	537, 115	8. 62	4, 631, 815
Alabama.....	314, 892	14. 25	4, 487, 211	436, 107	8. 58	3, 741, 453
Mississippi.....	309, 142	13. 50	4, 173, 417	411, 547	7. 51	3, 092, 697
Louisiana.....	177, 560	18. 00	3, 196, 080	289, 727	10. 09	2, 922, 217
Texas.....	816, 682	14. 50	11, 841, 889	6, 462, 536	9. 05	58, 512, 448
Arkansas.....	338, 863	11. 50	3, 896, 925	711, 278	8. 13	5, 782, 338
Tennessee.....	369, 999	16. 15	5, 975, 484	460, 165	9. 76	4, 493, 008
West Virginia.....	184, 106	20. 25	3, 728, 147	283, 501	17. 64	5, 000, 807
Kentucky.....	313, 859	21. 50	6, 747, 969	443, 707	17. 19	7, 628, 335
Ohio.....	767, 735	25. 95	19, 922, 723	845, 512	22. 20	18, 767, 498
Michigan.....	464, 070	27. 50	12, 761, 925	463, 134	20. 53	9, 506, 289
Indiana.....	663, 618	24. 50	16, 258, 641	1, 063, 531	20. 16	21, 436, 952
Illinois.....	1, 093, 812	23. 00	25, 157, 676	1, 538, 003	19. 92	30, 639, 795
Wisconsin.....	715, 809	22. 91	16, 399, 184	820, 236	17. 79	14, 594, 293
Minnesota.....	571, 481	19. 50	11, 143, 880	648, 365	16. 31	10, 393, 683
Iowa.....	1, 291, 142	21. 00	27, 113, 982	2, 704, 342	19. 34	52, 313, 344
Missouri.....	834, 937	17. 00	14, 193, 929	1, 831, 856	15. 55	28, 479, 321
Kansas.....	727, 080	18. 50	13, 450, 980	1, 958, 735	16. 22	31, 772, 640
Nebraska.....	525, 035	18. 50	9, 713, 148	1, 566, 236	16. 17	25, 328, 073
South Dakota.....	223, 500	17. 75	3, 967, 125	389, 500	16. 27	6, 335, 725
North Dakota.....	117, 250	20. 50	2, 403, 625	255, 680	18. 59	4, 752, 725
Montana.....	36, 419	28. 50	1, 037, 942	1, 036, 227	17. 42	18, 049, 013
Wyoming.....	17, 815	30. 00	534, 450	774, 943	15. 40	11, 934, 118
Colorado.....	63, 437	25. 50	1, 617, 644	830, 251	16. 90	14, 027, 924
New Mexico.....	18, 400	20. 00	368, 000	1, 249, 537	10. 03	12, 529, 733
Arizona.....	16, 907	21. 00	355, 047	822, 154	15. 10	12, 414, 525
Utah.....	55, 042	24. 00	1, 321, 008	390, 649	15. 58	5, 305, 016
Nevada.....	16, 393	30. 00	491, 790	253, 998	15. 59	3, 960, 034
Idaho.....	30, 419	25. 00	760, 475	417, 424	15. 50	6, 470, 072
Washington.....	101, 435	33. 00	3, 347, 355	429, 782	22. 10	9, 496, 673
Oregon.....	107, 183	24. 00	2, 572, 392	781, 110	15. 67	12, 238, 899
California.....	299, 237	27. 25	8, 154, 208	916, 414	17. 12	15, 690, 840
Total.....	16, 424, 087	21. 75	357, 299, 785	35, 954, 196	15. 24	547, 882, 204

*Estimated number of animals on farms and ranches, etc.—Continued.*

States and Territories.	Sheep.			Hogs.		
	Number.	Average price.	Value.	Number.	Average price.	Value.
Maine . . . . .	398,704	\$2.77	\$1,103,413	76,918	\$10.15	\$780,721
New Hampshire . . . . .	135,848	2.92	396,676	51,147	10.23	523,364
Vermont . . . . .	329,612	3.64	1,199,392	74,047	10.14	751,205
Massachusetts . . . . .	53,032	4.28	226,712	65,871	10.73	706,796
Rhode Island . . . . .	12,260	4.21	51,615	13,617	9.95	135,486
Connecticut . . . . .	42,479	4.04	171,743	54,329	10.15	551,442
New York . . . . .	1,492,528	3.81	5,690,263	645,691	8.88	5,736,962
New Jersey . . . . .	61,246	4.19	256,743	181,020	11.52	2,085,984
Pennsylvania . . . . .	1,637,216	3.69	6,047,876	1,076,580	8.89	9,572,733
Delaware . . . . .	13,551	3.62	48,987	52,167	7.00	365,167
Maryland . . . . .	151,506	3.95	598,222	325,477	7.18	2,337,576
Virginia . . . . .	498,400	3.00	1,497,194	920,228	4.10	3,772,013
North Carolina . . . . .	396,115	1.62	641,707	1,259,402	4.05	5,094,282
South Carolina . . . . .	78,384	1.90	148,929	697,746	4.53	3,160,512
Georgia . . . . .	432,809	1.77	765,206	1,674,362	3.52	5,891,744
Florida . . . . .	106,495	1.92	204,471	388,074	2.50	972,514
Alabama . . . . .	358,158	1.51	542,251	1,484,558	3.21	4,761,719
Mississippi . . . . .	447,156	1.49	664,027	1,371,485	3.05	4,183,030
Louisiana . . . . .	191,951	1.55	296,641	767,779	3.38	2,598,165
Texas . . . . .	4,334,551	1.60	6,924,445	2,344,458	3.86	9,049,608
Arkansas . . . . .	240,326	1.51	361,714	1,563,322	3.00	4,689,967
Tennessee . . . . .	541,427	2.27	1,230,285	1,989,741	4.69	9,339,843
West Virginia . . . . .	841,434	2.99	2,519,253	442,765	5.34	2,364,631
Kentucky . . . . .	1,237,338	3.29	4,075,792	1,994,277	5.41	10,791,033
Ohio . . . . .	4,378,725	3.17	13,900,263	2,423,544	7.42	17,984,638
Michigan . . . . .	2,518,544	3.38	8,512,679	713,630	7.43	5,302,272
Indiana . . . . .	1,080,383	3.84	4,145,430	2,017,376	7.68	15,493,446
Illinois . . . . .	1,187,329	3.65	4,337,906	3,720,059	8.14	30,281,284
Wisconsin . . . . .	1,198,175	3.01	3,608,903	921,018	8.31	7,653,657
Minnesota . . . . .	499,941	2.90	1,447,829	550,453	7.62	4,195,003
Iowa . . . . .	791,043	3.60	2,847,755	6,181,628	8.79	54,348,874
Missouri . . . . .	1,099,948	2.80	3,079,414	4,076,392	5.87	23,908,041
Kansas . . . . .	389,629	2.50	974,033	2,445,341	7.90	19,329,687
Nebraska . . . . .	272,502	2.65	723,084	2,198,909	6.02	17,624,258
South Dakota . . . . .	324,000	3.29	1,066,608	239,250	8.19	1,960,654
North Dakota . . . . .	390,400	3.01	1,173,699	90,250	7.43	670,378
Montana . . . . .	2,528,098	2.58	6,528,560	38,616	9.44	364,730
Wyoming . . . . .	1,198,567	2.75	3,300,255	15,834	8.71	137,993
Colorado . . . . .	1,231,484	2.52	3,105,803	25,511	7.25	184,956
New Mexico . . . . .	2,730,082	1.50	4,101,948	24,355	6.45	157,090
Arizona . . . . .	580,879	2.25	1,306,978	19,536	6.25	122,100
Utah . . . . .	2,117,577	2.38	5,036,022	47,136	8.86	417,624
Nevada . . . . .	555,181	2.43	1,347,092	11,363	6.86	77,949
Idaho . . . . .	764,262	2.50	1,910,655	57,015	7.50	427,613
Washington . . . . .	823,825	2.83	2,328,130	158,230	7.64	1,208,878
Oregon . . . . .	2,456,077	2.40	5,903,182	204,609	4.46	912,760
California . . . . .	4,124,376	2.32	9,559,479	399,691	6.12	2,446,110
Total . . . . .	47,273,553	2.66	125,909,264	46,094,807	6.41	295,426,492

### NOTES FROM REPORTS OF STATE AGENTS.

**CONNECTICUT.**—Live stock of all kinds is in good condition. Horses are slowly increasing in numbers and the home-grown in quality. Common horses are very cheap and the average price per head "over three years old" will not exceed that of those "between two and three years," as a large per cent of the former are old or unsound.

Milch cows have about held their own in numbers, and the increased price of butter has made up for the shortage attributable to the inadequate supply of winter fodder in some sections. Oxen and other cattle are kept in reduced numbers, as there is little market for home-grown beef, and the same cause depresses the price of milch cows—of little value in the dairy.

Sheep are more sought after, as their value in maintaining the productiveness of our pastures and as weed exterminators is becoming established. The low price of wool and the relatively high price of good lamb and mutton unite to favor the choice of mutton breeds. Where sheep abound the per cent of loss from dogs is small. Where sheep were few they have been nearly exterminated.

NEW YORK.—There is a steadily increasing interest in horse-breeding in this State, as farmers begin to realize that they can raise horses superior to those shipped from the West, as the soil, grass, and water of New York give a stronger bone, sounder feet, and harder muscle than alkaline soil, upon which so many Western horses are reared. Attention is also given to breeding a finer class of horses for road and carriage purposes, and enhanced value is the result for this class.

The increase in dairy stock has been very slight. Sheep are not as extensively bred as formerly, and principally for mutton rather than for production of wool. The higher valuation of hogs is the result of ruling low prices for several years, which caused this stock to be neglected.

NEW JERSEY.—The steady increase of population and the cultivation of new lands have naturally increased farm stock. The extra supply of horses comes mainly from the West, but there is a noticeable increase in dairy stock, and farmers are breeding up their herds from the best stock on hand or procurable. Holsteins, Guernseys and Alderneys are growing in favor. The continued low price of grain has led to a steady decrease in cereal production, and the dairy business has correspondingly increased.

The sheep business is menaced by dogs, and its increase is slow; but the production of winter lambs for holiday and early spring markets, is improving. The swine industry has declined still further; and, this year, to the great loss of farmers, as the opening of European markets for our pork has greatly advanced the price.

DELAWARE.—In New Castle County a disease is prevalent among cattle and horses which veterinarians call "anthrax," and in consequence some farmers will abandon the farms for dairying purposes.

MARYLAND.—The number of horses is constantly on the increase, and their value somewhat improved by judicious breeding; still the price is lower, owing to decreased demand. No diseases reported. The number of milch cows is greater, and the number of oxen and other cattle less than last year, and the slight falling off in the price of each is mainly due to the short hay crop. No diseases are reported among cattle or sheep.

VIRGINIA.—Horses show an increase in number over last year, but sales are small and prices somewhat reduced. Mules are diminishing in number in this State.

Cattle were sold off close, owing to scarcity of feed produced by drought. Prices were somewhat lower than usual. Sheep are in good condition and demanding fair prices. The same may be said of hogs.

NORTH CAROLINA.—The "no fence" law has done much toward reducing the number of worthless animals and causing owners to improve the grade of their stock.

Horses have increased in value by the introduction of Hanbletonians and other thoroughbred stallions and brood mares; and Jerseys, Ayrshires, and other high-grade cattle are becoming numerous in dairy stock.

FLORIDA.—The cattle interest of the State consists principally of "stock" cattle, which range at large and are not fed. There has been no increase during the past year, owing to deficient feed and water—the result of drought during early summer—and to the attacks of the buffalo gnat.

Sheep raising is a profitable business in this State, and there has been a noticeable increase, notwithstanding a loss of 3 per cent from dogs.

ALABAMA.—An increased interest in stock-raising is reported, and in counties where the stock law is in force the tendency is to reduce the number and improve the breed. Stock generally is in good condition, but prices are low. Not much attention is paid to sheep husbandry, and the sheep are of an inferior kind. In some sections the industry is being abandoned on account of the ravages of dogs; and in Washington County a loss of lambs is reported from wild hogs, wild cats, and foxes. In many counties there is a large increase in number of hogs and they are healthy and in fine condition, especially where they are allowed to run at large. Only five counties report cholera. In Franklin hogs are dying in the pen with "some kind of fever," and in Fayette with an "unknown disease."

MISSISSIPPI.—Horses are in excess of last year as to number, but prices are very low. Cattle have decreased in number and value as compared with 1892 and are mainly of common stock. All stock is reported healthy.

TEXAS.—There is an increase in the number of horses as compared with 1892, and more attention is given to raising horses of better breeds. Farmers and stockmen generally are paying more attention to milch cows. They are introducing better breeds and a greater number is raised. The number of sheep has not increased to any appreciable extent and few were killed by either wolves or dogs. Hogs show no increase.

ARKANSAS.—The increase in horses and mules is perhaps something more than normal, while prices are below the average, due to the partial failure of the cotton crop, which rendered it necessary for farmers to dispose of all salable stock at such prices as could be secured in the home market.

An increase of milch cows, oxen, and other cattle of a better grade is also perceptible. Sheep show about an average increase, but the common stock is being graded up. The ravages from dogs, wolves, etc.—the only serious drawback to successful sheep-growing in this State—seem to have been less than heretofore. Hogs, upon a full estimate, show a healthy increase, but owing to the failure of cotton they have been sold earlier and closer than usual and at unremunerative prices. Still the supply of pork for home consumption is considered ample in many localities. Live stock in general has been perfectly free from epidemic diseases and fairly good in condition.

TENNESSEE.—A decrease is indicated in the number of mules, milch cows, oxen, and other cattle, sheep, and hogs, as compared with January 1, 1892. Notwithstanding the decreased numbers, stock of any kind—excepting hogs—is not in demand at satisfactory prices; and farmers, though discouraged, are holding on for better returns. The drought of last fall forced them to commence feeding their stock a month earlier than usual; to this is added the coldest weather to date for five years, and fears of a deficit in grain and feed to carry them safely through winter.

The decrease in hogs is partly due to cholera of last year, but also to the demand which has been general throughout the State for fat and stock hogs at better prices than for several years.

WEST VIRGINIA.—Horses have increased in number, but decreased in value as compared with 1892. All grades are dull sale. Few mules are raised, although good mules command a higher price than the average farm horse of the same age.

Milch cows are slightly below the average, while oxen are very scarce, and the number of other cattle has decreased owing to the scarcity and high price of feed. Sheep and hogs have fallen off in number and hogs command high prices.

OHIO.—Common horses are still plenty and cheap. Good horses are in demand at fair prices.

The prices for beef cattle are low; there is also anxiety as regards the wool prospect. Butter and mutton sustain, to some extent, the beef-making and wool-growing industries. The scarcity of hogs is due to the high price of corn and low price of hogs previous to January, 1892, to a poor corn prospect early in the season of 1892, and the prevailing high price for fat hogs, inducing farmers to feed and sell their stock short. All live stock is reported healthy.

MICHIGAN.—There is a gradual increase in the number of horses in the State, owing to the lack of demand. Only occasional sales are made, as from one farmer, who has a surplus, to his neighbor, who happens to need one, and that at a very low price. The gentleman's driver continues in demand, and sells at a good figure. The comparatively few mules used are mostly brought from Indiana and Missouri.

Cattle are still decreasing in number, except milch cows, with prices slightly stimulated by the decrease. Milch cows command a somewhat better price. The breeders of blooded stock are still holding their best animals, hoping in the near future to command more remunerative prices. Sheep are still considered the most

profitable stock for the average farmer. The mutton and cross breeds are most popular. The decrease in the number of hogs is noticeable. As a result of the low price of last year, together with the comparatively high price of corn, few farmers have had any to sell at the enhanced price of the present fall, which is almost double that of last year.

INDIANA.—There is no material change in the number of horses, but mules and cattle fall a few points below the average, and as regards price all rule low.

Sheep have increased in number over last year and fewer have been killed by dogs than for several years. The hog crop falls very short of an average, and as a consequence prices for fat hogs range higher than for years. Live stock of all kinds are unusually free from disease.

ILLINOIS.—Of the surplus of work horses few sales are made, even at prices 10 to 15 per cent below last year's. There is a better demand for "good" and "choice" draft, carriage, and driving horses at fair figures. Mules show a small increase in number and they command better prices than horses.

There is a small decrease in milch cows, although in dairy counties there is little change. The loss is due to the low price of country butter, which induced farmers to limit the number of cows to the needs of the family. The cattle industry is gradually declining. There has been a large increase in the number of sheep the past year. Mutton sheep and lambs have been in demand at good prices. The decrease in number of hogs reaches nearly one-fourth; this is traceable to the loss from cold, wet weather in spring, the discouraging prospect for the new corn crop, or the fear of cholera, which hastened the sale of all that could be put in condition.

MINNESOTA.—The supply of horses is still insufficient notwithstanding the increase of past years. Mules are increasing in number. Milch cows are in great demand.

Prices range a little higher than last year for all stock, but pork is much in excess.

IOWA.—Horse-raising of all kinds, excepting the trotting horse, is at a low ebb. Dairy interests are growing and milch cows are in demand at advanced prices.

The sheep industry continues to grow, and there is a widespread demand for sheep of the improved mutton breeds at good prices. Mutton is made the prime consideration and wool secondary. Owing to the late, cold, rainy spring the loss in spring pigs was very heavy. The prevailing high prices have taken everything marketable, and the number of hogs on hand is comparatively low.

MISSOURI.—The number of horses has been sustained by shipments from Western ranges and by lack of usual demand, and farmers are unwilling to sell at the prices offered. There is ready sale for well-bred horses at a good figure, and there is an increasing tendency to improve the grade. A few central counties report cases of fatal distemper. All other sections report perfect freedom from disease.

The number of milch cows was reduced by the very low price of all cattle and high price of feed. All other cattle are low in price, and condition is not up to an average, although the weather has been favorable and there has been almost an absence of disease. Sheep-raising would be general but for fear of ravages from dogs. The loss reported from this cause is very heavy in counties where small flocks are grown.

There are fewer hogs in the State than for many years past, due to the loss of young pigs during the long wet spring and the high price now paid for marketable hogs. The demand for stock hogs is so great that the price almost equals that of fat hogs. Little disease is reported, two counties only reporting cholera.

KANSAS.—The supply of horses is greater than the demand except for good draft horses and roadsters. Mules show a slight decrease and are in better demand than horses. Milch cows are about the same as last year. The decrease in number of "other cattle" is considerable. Low price of beef and high price of corn have not encouraged cattle-growers. The high prices which have prevailed for pork induced farmers to put upon the market everything in the pork line until, in many localities, there is a scarcity of stock hogs and breeders.

NEBRASKA.—Comparatively few sheep are killed by dogs in these newer regions. Wolves are the great depredators. Knowing this, sheep-growers herd and fold with greater care here than in older States; and the loss, by either, is less in proportion.

SOUTH DAKOTA.—Horses show an increase in number; mules a decided decrease as compared with January, 1892. Cattle are uniformly low. Sheep average good. More damage to the latter is reported from wolves than dogs.

NORTH DAKOTA.—In the eastern and central parts of the State the tendency is to reduce stock cattle because of such low prices that there is no profit where long feeding is necessary. On the ranges in the western part there is a normal increase, as much less feed is required. The spring was unfavorable for sheep. Many lambs were lost and a number of old sheep. The latter no doubt was due to the scarcity of feed during the long winter and cold backward spring.

Hogs are scarce and high and the demand consequently great.

WYOMING.—A marked decrease has taken place in the number of cattle in this State each year since 1885. This has resulted from overstocked ranges, loss from exposure, the decline in prices of beef cattle, which caused many to withdraw from cattle business, and the stealing of cattle by so-called "rustlers."

The sheep industry has been steadily growing in importance, and has been quite profitable; the price per head having advanced greatly within five years.

COLORADO.—Cattle show a decided decrease in number, due to the contraction of ranges to farm limits, and to the practice of spaying cows. The increase in corn areas and the demonstrated advantages of raising swine have given a great impetus to that business, particularly in the Arkansas Valley and eastern Colorado.

WASHINGTON.—Two influences have been at work to curtail the increase of live stock in this State, low prices and the restriction of free range. A natural increase is noted in the number of horses, but in many districts they are unsalable at any respectable figure. Poor horses are not wanted at any price. Consequently the breeds are being improved.

There is an actual decline in the number of cattle, owing to low prices.

CALIFORNIA.—In numbers horses show an increase, but in price a decrease, notwithstanding a great improvement in quality has taken place during the past ten years. At that time the Spanish horse, mustang, or broncho, predominated; now draft horses and trotters lead, and as a consequence small horses, or ponies, are almost unsalable. For draft purposes in cities, Norman and Clydesdale are the favorites, while for farm purposes the half-breeds are more in demand, because of their greater activity and lighter weight. Few mules are raised in the State, yet the number is somewhat increased over last year, and prices are better.

Milch cows show a decrease in number, as many tracts of dairy land have been put into fruit farms. Sheep have decreased in number and increased in price, as good mutton sheep are rather scarce. The loss from ravages of dogs, coyotes, and other wild animals is very insignificant. Hogs have decreased in both number and price.

## COTTON.

The February returns, which relate to cotton, give county estimates of the crop compared with that of last year, the proportion that has left the plantation, average date of close of picking, insect losses, etc.

The consolidation of returns of comparative crop makes the following State percentages: Virginia, 55 per cent; North Carolina, 73; South Carolina, 75; Georgia, 74; Florida, 60; Alabama, 65; Mississippi, 60; Louisiana, 55; Texas, 84; Arkansas, 58; Tennessee, 63. General average, 69.2. No allowance is made by the Statistician for underestimate of the crop or overestimate of the distribution. The crop is therefore

somewhat larger than is here indicated, if returns have been conservative, as usual. Years ago, when the Statistician made allowances for underestimate and prepared an official estimate of the entire product, the size of the crop was very closely forecast.

The proportion of the crop received at the ports in stocks of interior towns in hands of merchants unreported and en route from plantations is thus stated, as reported by county correspondents: Virginia, 86; North Carolina, 85; South Carolina, 87; Georgia, 89; Florida, 89; Alabama, 89; Mississippi, 88; Louisiana, 89; Texas, 87; Arkansas, 87; Tennessee, 86. General average, 87.9.

Quality is fairly good, as a rule, though better on the Atlantic coast and in Texas than in the interior areas. In the later picking, cotton was much discolored by frost. In most of the States the average yield of lint is reported at 32 per cent.

Losses from insect depredations were relatively small. No losses are reported north of Georgia and the Gulf States, except in Arkansas. The boll worm did more damage than the caterpillar, mainly in Mississippi.

The average dates of picking, compared with previous years, are as follows:

*Cotton.—Average time of close of picking.*

States.	1892.	1891.	1890.	1889.	1888.
Virginia .....	Nov. 30	Dec. 11	Dec. 22	Dec. 13	Dec. 24
North Carolina.....	Dec. 1	Dec. 10	Dec. 15	Dec. 9	Dec. 12
South Carolina.....	Dec. 1	Dec. 8	Dec. 23	Dec. 10	Dec. 13
Georgia .....	Nov. 27	Dec. 4	Dec. 12	Dec. 11	Dec. 12
Florida.....	Nov. 15	Nov. 20	Dec. 5	Nov. 20	Nov. 27
Alabama .....	Nov. 28	Dec. 2	Dec. 13	Dec. 12	Dec. 1
Mississippi .....	Dec. 3	Dec. 10	Dec. 15	Dec. 12	Dec. 13
Louisiana .....	Dec. 4	Dec. 12	Dec. 16	Dec. 7	Dec. 7
Texas .....	Dec. 15	Dec. 4	Dec. 10	Dec. 13	Dec. 9
Arkansas .....	Dec. 16	Dec. 11	Dec. 16	Dec. 20	Dec. 19
Tennessee.....	Dec. 5	Dec. 12	Dec. 15	Dec. 12	Dec. 11

  

States.	1887.	1886.	1885.	1884.	1883.
Virginia .....	Dec. 10	Jan. 2*	Dec. 11	Dec. 6	Dec. 12
North Carolina.....	Dec. 10	Dec. 2	Dec. 2	Nov. 25	Nov. 28
South Carolina.....	Dec. 8	Nov. 30	Nov. 30	Nov. 20	Nov. 23
Georgia .....	Nov. 29	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	Nov. 19	Nov. 20
Florida.....	Dec. 4	Nov. 27	Nov. 25	Nov. 30	Nov. 30
Alabama .....	Nov. 24	Dec. 2	Nov. 28	Nov. 24	Nov. 24
Mississippi .....	Dec. 2	Dec. 7	Dec. 8	Nov. 23	Nov. 26
Louisiana .....	Dec. 13	Dec. 12	Dec. 10	Nov. 28	Nov. 23
Texas .....	Nov. 30	Dec. 3	Dec. 3	Nov. 20	Nov. 30
Arkansas .....	Nov. 26	Dec. 25	Dec. 4	Dec. 4	Dec. 12
Tennessee.....	Nov. 27	Dec. 14	Dec. 10	Nov. 30	Dec. 10

\* 1887.

The following notes relating to cotton are selected from the reports of State agents:

**VIRGINIA.**—The low price of cotton early in 1892 deterred the farmers from planting the usual acreage. The wet spring and early summer reduced the yield,

and later the drought operated against the crop. The picking season was dry and favorable and the staple was fair.

**NORTH CAROLINA.**—The picking season was very favorable, and cotton went to the gin in better condition than usual. More seed is being used for feeding cattle and composting than in former years.

**SOUTH CAROLINA.**—Previous estimates of the cotton crop are practically confirmed by returns of January 1, which indicate that it will not exceed three-fourths of the amount of the crop of 1891. In some parts of the State the staple is reported inferior to that of last year in length and strength of fiber; but all sections report freedom from trash and good color.

Between 75,000 and 100,000 tons of cotton seed have been sold to oil mills this year. The high price of hog products produced an unusual demand for cotton-seed oil. This caused active competition for seed and good prices were paid. Thus the quantity sold to the oil mills was much increased and the proceeds added materially to the profits of the cotton crop.

**Georgia.**—The unusually small percentage of the cotton crop remaining in the hands of planters or their agents, and the high price of cotton seed, are the remarkable features at this time, of the past year's crop.

The policy of selling cotton seed to oil mills is condemned by many farmers, but without sound reason, when they will command present prices. Moreover, if meal is taken in exchange for seed, it can be largely used as cattle food without greatly detracting from their value for manure; and as a fertilizer, 700 pounds of cotton-seed meal are equivalent to 2,000 pounds of whole seed.

**ALABAMA.**—The cotton crop of 1892 is short, due to reduced acreage, less fertilizers, excessive moisture, and early frosts. While the staple is short, there is an unusually large amount of seed. The weather was favorable for gathering and most of the crop is of good color and free from trash. The Peterkin variety yielded the largest amount of lint per 100 pounds of seed cotton. The damage from caterpillar was very slight, but that from bollworm was serious in a few counties. Nearly the whole crop has been marketed, and it is feared that there is not enough left for planting; especially with the colored tenants.

**MISSISSIPPI.**—The bulk of the cotton crop was gathered during November, but the remainder was all secured about December 1. While the crop has been very carefully gathered clear of trash, dirt or dust, the last picking was very much stained from being frost-bitten.

**LOUISIANA.**—The principal causes for the great decrease in the cotton crop of 1892 as compared with 1891 are: A large reduction in area; the overflow of bottom lands and the failure of such land to produce after being replanted, together with the extremely wet weather of spring and summer, which so retarded the crop that much was caught by early frost. The staple was fairly good, color fair, and rather free from trash. Indications are that a much larger area will be planted this year, and fertilizers will be more freely used than in the past.

**TEXAS.**—The yield of cotton is somewhat less than last year, but in length of staple, color, etc., it is a superior crop. Picking was practically finished December 1, and upwards of 90 per cent of the crop has been marketed. Little damage was done by either caterpillar or bollworm. Much of the seed is fed to cattle during the winter, but fully one-third of the crop of 1892 has been sold to the oil mills.

**ARKANSAS.**—The past year has been in most respects unfavorable for cotton-growing in this State. The opening of the season was late, and planting was delayed by cold, wet weather. The first planting was destroyed by the floods which inundated the better cotton lands at a time when the season was too far advanced for replanting to be practicable. Late planting was injured by wet weather and early frosts and badly stained in some sections by bollworms. It was generally inferior and trashy, but the early cotton made a fair yield of average quality.

TENNESSEE.—Owing to excessive rainfall last spring, which delayed the preparation of the soil, cotton was planted from four to six weeks late. Later in the season a drought set in, retarding the growth and development of the plant, and, as a result of these unfavorable conditions, the crop matured late and irregular. In length of staple and freedom from trash, the crop falls but little below an average, but it is badly discolored where frost occurred before the staple had matured.

MISSOURI.—Cotton is losing place among the staple crops of this State. Less than one dozen counties report cotton grown for commercial purposes in 1892. Lack of interest in the crop would have affected the area even had the conditions been most favorable; but as the heavy and continuous rains and the consequent overflow of the Mississippi River, and all small streams, made planting impossible in the very best cotton counties, the total acreage was reduced more than one half. Much cotton was late and suffered damage from frost, which, combined with a poor stand, makes the crop short in quality as well as yield.

The following are extracts from notes of correspondents relating to quality of cotton of the present crop:

NORTH CAROLINA.—*Richmond*: Good throughout the county, fine season, fair picking. *Tyrrell*: Average quality. *Lenoir*: Much better than usual. *Darle*: Staple short, whiter, and less trash than usual. *Beaufort*: Good. *Union*: Up to the average. *Perquimans*: Staple short, color good, very little trash. *Halifax*: Staple good, color good, unusually free from trash. *Davidson*: Good color and free from trash. *Gaston*: No trash nor stain, staple shorter than usual. *Montgomery*: Staple not so long as usual, owing to premature ripening in consequence of the dry seasons; in other respects it is better than usual. *Rowan*: Staple rather short, but free from trash. *Wake*: Staple good length and free from trash. *Wilson*: Staple not above the average quality; color and freedom from trash far above the average. *Moore*: Staple short, but good color. *Onslow*: Generally free from stain and trash. *Iredell*: Below the average in both length of staple and color.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—*Greenville*: A better grade, and freer from trash and dirt than usual. *Barnwell*: Good. *Abbeville*: Staple better than for years. Color and freedom from trash hardly up to the average. *Georgetown*: Staple medium. Color good, and free from trash. *Newbury*: Generally free from trash, the lint has not averaged well in weight in comparison with the seed. *Chester*: Staple short. Color good. *Anderson*: Staple short. Color not good, less trash than usual. *Lexington*: Staple good. Color bright and generally free from trash.

GEORGIA.—*Campbell*: The staple not good; color and freedom from trash an average. *Carroll*: Staple short; color good and free from trash. *Chattooga*: Some of the crop is yellow, but there is little trash. *Coffee*: Generally good; rain injured the color of the first picking. *Greene*: The staple was a little off, but freedom from trash and general good condition made up for it. *Harris*: Staple not good. *Houston*: Lint stained and dirty, owing to heavy rains in the early fall. *Putnam*: Staple as good as last year; color not so good; very clear of trash. *Richmond*: Good. *Webster*: Above the average. *Worth*: Very fine. *Fayette*: Quality good and free from trash. *McDuffie*: Very superior in color; staple, and freedom from trash. *Cherokee*: Staple short, but clear of trash and dirt. *Dooly*: Color good and not very much trash. *Irwin*: Staple short, color good, and free from trash. *Morgan*: Very good color and free from trash. *Newton*: Staple; good color, and freedom from trash; hardly up to the average. *Troup*: Staple, and freedom from trash; above the average. *Dawson*: Quality very fine. *Taylor*: Staple good; color good; very little trash. *Walker*: Staple short; otherwise good. *Lowndes*: Very good, all round; was gathered as it opened, and is excellent. *Paulding*: Lint is short, but the color and careful handling brought it up to a fair average. *Whitfield*: Average length of staple; color good, and but little trash. *Wilkinson*: Better than for years in every respect; staple, color, and freedom from trash. *Catoosa*: Staple

same as last year; a little whiter, but not so free from trash. *Fulton*: Length of staple superior to any in years; color better than for five years, and almost free from trash.

**FLORIDA.**—*Wakulla*: Staple above the average. *Washington*: Staple seriously injured by rain during July and August. *Liberty*: Staple very short.

**ALABAMA.**—*Winston*: Good; fine lint, no trash. *Choctaw*: Good. *Marengo*: Inferior to 1891. *Dallas*: Lint short, owing to unfavorable weather during plant development; staple white, clean, and free from trash. *Shelby*: In length of staple, color, and freedom from trash the crop is fully up to the average. *Conecuh*: Quality good; length of staple short, free from trash. *Fayette*: Stained by early frost; staple fair and free from trash. *Monroe*: Staple short. *Sumter*: The crop is very free from dirt and trash. *Escambia*: Length of staple and color good, free from trash.

**MISSISSIPPI.**—*Marshall*: Fair, some tinges and stains. *Itawamba*: Length of staple less than last year, color poor. *Hinds*: Length five per cent shorter than an average crop, is free from trash and stain. *Choctaw*: Color better than last year, is free from trash. *Calhoun*: Color good, staple, rather short. *Attala*: Quality never better. *Wilkinson*: Length of staple short, other points good. *Simpson*: Fair to middling. *Lee*: Short, staple, clear of trash, very little stain. *Monroe*: Staple, shorter than usual; color bad, much of it stained by frost; very trashy, due to continued rains. *DeFlore*: Length of staple short, color good, free from trash. *Leake*: Staple rather below the average in length; color good and free from trash. *Jasper*: Staple a little above the average. *Scott*: Short, from excessive rains. *Lincoln*: Length of staple is below the average, while color and freedom from trash would average high. *Greene*: Poor, injured by wet weather. *Alcorn*: Staple short. *Pontotoc*: Staple short, color fair, quite trashy. *Lafayette*: Quality good, some stain from bollworm. *Franklin*: Short crop, picked early, with very little trash.

**LOUISIANA.**—*Iberia*: Above the average, owing to fine weather during the picking season. *Webster*: Staple short, clear of trash, fine color, and good quality. *Sabine*: Picked clean, more long staple planted than usual. *St. Tammany*: Yield and quality best in years. *St. Martin*: Season dry and favorable for picking; quality of the staple good; was gathered free from trash. *St. Landry*: Staple lighter; shorter; and better color than usual. *Ascension*: Staple short, color good, free from trash.

**TEXAS.**—*Throckmorton*: Good. *Montgomery*: Above the average in quality. *Lavaca*: Quality will compare favorably with other years. *Kauffman*: Staple long, free from leaves and trash, quality good. *Shackelford*: Very good. *Stephens*: Fair average; good and clean. *Shelby*: Very good; excellent weather for gathering. *Blanco*: Staple long; color good. *Val Verde*: Length of staple fine. *Rockwell*: Staple short; otherwise about as last year. *Reeves*: Good color; free from trash. *Rains*: Free from trash, is fine color; length of staple, medium. *Marion*: Very little stain or trash. *Morris*: Staple short and badly stained. *Harrison*: Quality best in years. *Gregg*: Less trash than usual. *Guadalupe*: Staple long and free from trash. *Erath*: Length of staple fine; less trash than usual. *Nueces*: Staple shorter than last year. *Fort Bend*: About the same as last year. *San Augustine*: Season is remarkably favorable for picking, hence the freedom from trash, stain, etc. *Hill*: Better staple than usual and quite free from trash. *Camp*: The high grade is owing to great care and facilities of cleaning. *Jones*: Well gathered, dry and clean; long staple and fine color. *Upshur*: Staple short; color dull; more trash than usual. *Cass*: Owing to excessive rains the crop is very trashy. *Collin*: Staple is short; season was unfavorable for saving cotton in good condition. *Taylor*: Quality, staple, and color all high grade.

**ARKANSAS.**—*Carroll*: Very little grown. *Randolph*: Free from trash; color injured by continued rains. *Prairie*: Staple poor, due to the wet fall; trashy, and bad color. *Union*: Staple short and light. *Pike*: Staple good, color poor; not very trashy. *Garland*: Staple poor. *Franklin*: Staple short, color good, free from trash. *Colum-*

*bia*: Staple short; rain damaged the color. *Cleveland*: Staple long; somewhat stained. *Sevier*: Quality poor; was planted late; most of it was caught by frost. *Montgomery*: Badly stained.

**TENNESSEE.**—*Rutherford*: Staple fair, color good, free from trash. *Gibson*: Quality good. *Marshall*: Staple good. *Hardeman*: Staple poor. *Crockett*: Lint good. *Fayette*: Frost nearly ruined the crop, making it yellow and stained. *Marshall*: Staple short, color good; owing to the late favorable fall it was free from trash. *Lincoln*: Length of staple good, color and freedom from trash below the average.

**MISSOURI.**—*Pemiscat*: Staple, color, and freedom from trash; above the average. *Bates*: Length of staple about an average, and very free from trash. *New Madrid*: Badly stained. *Howell*: Up to the average in everything but color.



